

**MINUTES
OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE
EDINA CITY COUNCIL AND
THE EDINA HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
HELD AT CITY HALL
DECEMBER 7, 1999 - 7:00 P.M.**

ROLLCALL Answering rollcall were Members Faust, Hovland, Kelly and Mayor Maetzold. Member Johnson entered the meeting at 7:07 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS APPROVED Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust approving the Council Consent Agenda as presented.

Rollcall:

Ayes: Faust, Hovland, Kelly, Maetzold

Motion carried.

***MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 16, 1999, APPROVED** Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust approving the minutes of the November 16, 1999, Regular Council Meeting.

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

JOINT HRA/CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING HELD RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AMENDING GRANDVIEW AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN Affidavits of Notice were presented, approved and ordered placed on file.

Manager Hughes stated the proposed amendments to the Grandview Area Redevelopment Plan and the Grandview Tax Increment Financing Plan are necessary to facilitate the redevelopment of properties located south of Eden Avenue. The amendments would also provide the necessary authority for the HRA to pursue the acquisition of privately held properties which may be included in the redevelopment proposed by Opus Construction and Ron Clark Construction. The amendment to the Redevelopment Project consists of (i) the acquisition and redevelopment by the HRA or another party of all or a portion of the Redevelopment Property not previously acquired by the HRA, (ii) the construction by the HRA, the City or another party on the Redevelopment Property of a public library and senior center and (iii) other public redevelopment costs incurred in connection with the redevelopment of the Redevelopment Property.

The estimated proposed additional expenses of tax increment related to the acquisition and redevelopment are as follows:

Acquisition of Property	\$3,100,000
Construction of library	2,860,000
Construction of senior center	2,145,000
Parking & Site Development	3,940,000
Demolition	500,000
Financing Costs	175,000
Off-site Improvements	500,000
Administration	<u>500,000</u>
Sub-total	\$13,720,000
Contingency 10%	<u>1,372,000</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$15,092,000</u>

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

Mr. Hughes added that as prescribed by State Law; a copy of the proposed Amendments to the Redevelopment Plan and Tax Increment Finance Plan were provided to Hennepin County and Independent School District 273. He noted receipt of a response from Hennepin County via a memorandum written by Sandra L. Vargas, County Administrator to the Board of Commissioners. The Hennepin County response supports the proposed amendment. Mr. Hughes stated that no response had been received from School District 273.

Member Kelly asked if the Wanner property had been included in the Grandview Area Redevelopment Area. Mr. Hughes using a map to show the property on the eastern side of the proposed redevelopment area, pointed out the Wanner property and said it was included in the proposed redevelopment area.

Member Kelly stated he remained concerned regarding construction of a new library. He wants to make sure the City does not give greater value than it receives in return. This does not necessarily need to be actual dollars, but it should be something of value. Mayor Maetzold noted a possibility exists that meeting or auditorium space may be constructed that the City could use for public meetings. Member Johnson added he believed staff understands the Council's concern and should be allowed to negotiate the best possible deal.

Member Faust asked if the proposed amendment is what is necessary to meet the December 31, 1999, deadline with the State of Minnesota. Mr. Hughes explained the amendment must be approved in order for the redevelopment to take place. However, the City must have a Letter of Intent with their developer by December 31, 1999, in order to use the tax increment fund in this district as proposed.

Member Faust said she had been contacted by Vernon Terrace with a request for a presentation of the proposed redevelopment. She asked about the timing of such a presentation and if the developer should be requested to make the presentation. Mr. Hughes replied he believed that the developer should make the presentation and that Tom Lund could be contacted immediately and requested to schedule a time with the residents of Vernon Terrace.

Member Faust expressed her hope that the architecture of the redevelopment be different than Vernon Terrace. She asked if the redevelopment would follow the normal planning process per Edina's Code. Mr. Hughes assured her the redevelopment would follow the same planning process as a totally private development. He added he believed it was too early in the process to know in any detail the proposed architecture of the redevelopment.

Member Hovland commented that the Council's desire for the redevelopment was to see architecture significant for the space involved. He suggested that as the design is developed that design standards could be legally set forth if deemed necessary. Continuing, Member Hovland stated that perhaps actually taking legal action would be premature. Member Faust advised that in her experience, standards need be in place before a project begins. Mr. Hughes reminded the Council that the City owns half of the property involved in the proposed redevelopment; and therefore the City is in a very strong position to suggest design priorities. Mr. Hughes recommended that the Council not develop any design standards at this time.

Member Johnson voiced concern over the financing for the construction and operation of the Senior Center. Member Kelly agreed and suggested a very specific use agreement be delineated. Mayor Maetzold reminded that the Senior Center would be a City building. Mr. Hughes reiterated the Senior Center would be a City facility managed by the City. Member Johnson asked if the Senior Center would be self-supporting. Mr. Hughes responded that the City currently operates the existing

Senior Citizen Center located in the Community Center and it is not self-supporting. He said the operation of the new Senior Center may be reviewed and a decision made regarding whether or not the seniors should take greater responsibility in its operation.

Member Hovland commented that he saw the entire project as somewhat fluid, meaning that many changes may transpire over time regarding the size and design of the components. He added that he recalled the construction of a new library was recommended by staff as the best alternative to solve some facility expansion issues for the City.

Mayor Maetzold called for public comment. No one spoke.

Mayor Maetzold made a motion seconded by Member Johnson to close the public hearing.

Ayes: Faust, Hovland, Johnson, Kelly, Maetzold.

Motion carried.

Member Hovland introduced the following resolution and made a motion for its approval:

**RESOLUTION
APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO GRANDVIEW
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT NO. 1, GRANDVIEW AREA
REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AND GRANDVIEW
TAX INCREMENT FINANCING PLAN AND
MAKING FINDINGS WITH RESPECT THERETO**

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Edina, Minnesota as follows:

1. The Commissioners of the Housing and Redevelopment Authority in and for the City of Edina, Minnesota (the "HRA") and the City of Edina, Minnesota (the "City"), have previously approved the Grandview Area Redevelopment Plan (the "Redevelopment Plan") and Grandview Redevelopment Project No. 1 (the "Redevelopment Project") to be undertaken pursuant thereto, and in order to finance the public redevelopment costs to be incurred by the City and the HRA in connection with the Redevelopment Plan and Redevelopment Project, the HRA and the City have approved Grandview Tax Increment Financing Plan (the "Financing Plan"), which establishes a tax increment financing district which is designated by the HRA as the Grandview Tax Increment Financing District (Hennepin County No. 1202) (the "District"). On April 7, 1997, the HRA and City approved an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan, Redevelopment Project and Financing Plan (the "1997 Amendment"). The HRA has approved an amendment to the Redevelopment Project, the Redevelopment Plan and the Tax Increment Financing Plan, as amended by the 1997 Amendment, which is entitled "Amendments to Grandview Redevelopment Project No. 1, Grandview Area Redevelopment Plan and Grandview Tax Increment Financing Plan" (the "1999 Amendment"). The 1999 Amendment authorizes the acquisition and redevelopment by the HRA of the property in the area subject to the Redevelopment Plan and the additional expenditures of tax increment revenues derived from the District to pay public redevelopment costs of the acquisition and redevelopment of such property by the HRA or another party, including costs of a public library and senior center, and to pay administrative expenses of the HRA and City.

2. This Council on December 7, 1999, held a public hearing on the 1999 Amendment after notice of the public hearing was published in the official newspaper of the City not less than ten (10) days prior to the date of the hearing. At such public hearing all persons desiring to be heard with respect to the 1999 Amendment were given an opportunity to express their views with respect thereto.

3. This Council has previously found that the District is a redevelopment district within the scope of Minnesota Statutes, Section 469.174, subdivision 10 and the Amendment will

not change such prior findings. The 1999 Amendment further serves the original goals and objectives of the City and HRA in approving the Redevelopment Plan, the Redevelopment Project and the Financing Plan and the 1997 Amendment, by redeveloping property in the City in order to prevent or reduce blight, blighting factors and the causes of blight, and by providing needed public facilities.

4. Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 469.175, subdivision 4, it is hereby found that:

(A) The District, is a redevelopment district, as defined in Minnesota Statutes, Section 469.174, subdivision 10, for the reasons set forth in previous findings by this Council, and the 1999 Amendment does not alter these previous findings.

(B) The proposed development to be undertaken in accordance with the Redevelopment Plan, as amended by the 1999 Amendment, in the opinion of this Council would not occur solely through private investment within the reasonably foreseeable future and therefor the use of tax increment financing is deemed necessary.

(C) The Financing Plan, as amended by the 1999 Amendment, conforms to the general plan for the development of the City as a whole.

(D) The Financing Plan, as amended by the 1999 Amendment, will afford maximum opportunity consistent with the sound needs of the City as a whole for the development of the area subject to Redevelopment Plan by private enterprise.

(E) The City confirms its election of the method of tax increment computation set forth in Minnesota Statutes, Section 469.177, subdivision 3, clause (a) with respect to the District.

Passed by the Council this 7th day of December, 1999.

Attest: _____

Debra A. Mangen

Dennis F. Maetzold

Adopted this 7th day of December, 1999. Member Kelly seconded the motion.

Rollcall:

Ayes: Faust, Hovland, Johnson, Kelly, Maetzold

Motion carried.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UPHOLDING ZONING BOARD OF APPEAL'S DENIAL OF VARIANCE REQUEST, 7133 VALLEY VIEW ROAD Affidavits of Notice were presented, approved and ordered placed on file.

Assistant Planner Aaker stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals, on September 16, 1999, heard and tabled Lyubov and Eduard Yamnik's variance request from the frontyard setback requirements to allow them to locate a garage in their frontyard. Ms. Aaker explained that subject property is characterized by steep slopes and is heavily wooded. Extensive use of retaining walls were necessary to develop the property. The Yamnik's desire to construct an in-ground garage fronting Valley View Road. The proposed garage would cut through the lower retaining wall beneath the existing driveway. Due to the existing vegetation it is difficult to see the retaining wall during the summer months.

The existing house provides a 37-foot setback. The garage door opening would be flush with an existing retaining wall and would be the only visible part of the garage. The required setback for any

new structure on the lot would be 47 feet. The proposed garage would provide a 10-foot setback requiring a 37-foot variance. The current wooded condition of the lot is typical of the Indian Hills area. Ms. Aaker reported that staff does not support the variance request because development of a garage would significantly alter the wooded condition to the detriment of the neighborhood. Since the property meets code with respect to garage stalls no hardship is present.

On November 18, 1999, the homeowners returned to the Zoning Board with no change in their plan. The Zoning Board denied the requested variance. Ms. Aaker added that within the neighborhood the steep driveway is not unique.

Proponents

Lyubov and Eduard Yamnik, 7133 Valley View Road, presented their request for a variance. Mrs. Yamnik explained that they were not seeking the variance to allow additional garage space, but because they feel their driveway and access are too dangerous. Since the existing retaining wall is deteriorated and needs repair, the Yamnik felt this was the opportune time to build a garage at the lower level. Mr. Yamnik showed a home video depicting their home, driveway, the state of the existing retaining walls, the current access onto Valley View and the proposed location of the new garage and driveway accessing Valley View.

Council Discussion/Action

Member Faust said she noticed it looked like there would be room to add to the existing garage on the north side. She stated she would possibly be willing to grant some relief for an addition to the existing garage, but not for the requested 37 foot frontyard variance. Member Faust said the requested variance is too large and that other homes in the neighborhood have even steeper driveways. For this reason she does not believe an undue hardship exists so there would be no reason to grant any kind of variance.

Member Kelly voiced his agreement with Member Faust.

Member Hovland questioned whether any option existed where the existing driveway grade could be reduced. He thought he could support a variance if a modification to the existing driveway and garage were sought. Member Hovland also stated he did not believe the requested variance represented an undue hardship, therefore he would not support the variance.

Mayor Maetzold suggested that the Yamniks investigate other options, such as heating coils installed under the surface of the driveway, or some other options to ameliorate their problem with winter conditions. He added he also would not support the requested variance.

Member Johnson made a motion, seconded by Member Kelly to close the hearing.

Ayes: Faust, Hovland, Johnson, Kelly, Maetzold

Motion carried.

Member Faust introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Edina Zoning Board of Appeals on the 17th of October, 1999, did review and unanimously deny the request for a variance from setback to allow a garage to encroach into the frontyard setback at 7133 Valley View Road; and

WHEREAS, the property owners Lyubov and Eduard Yamnik did appeal the aforementioned variance denial within the prescribed time to the Edina City Council; and

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

WHEREAS, the Edina City Council held a public hearing where the appellants were allowed to state their request, public testimony was taken.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Edina City Council upholds the Zoning Board of Appeals' denial of the requested variance to allow the location of garage within the frontyard setback at 7133 Valley View Road.

Adopted this 7th day of December, 1999. Member Hovland seconded the motion.

Rollcall;

Ayes: Faust, Hovland, Johnson, Kelly, Maetzold

Resolution approved.

*LOT DIVISION AT 5300 FRANCE AVENUE SOUTH APPROVED Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust introducing the following resolution and moving its approval:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the following described properties are at present single tracts of land:

PARCEL 1: Lots 1 and 2, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lot 3, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lots 4 and 6, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lot 5, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lot 7, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lots, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17, and Lot 9, except the East 150.00 feet thereof, and the Easterly 45.00 feet of Lots 19, 20, and 21; and that part of Lots 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, and 33, lying East of the following described line: Commencing at a point on the South line of said Lot 24 a distance of 63.00 feet West of the Southeast corner thereof; thence North to a point on the North line of said Lot 28 a distance of 84.00 feet West of the Northeast corner thereof; thence continuing North along the last described line extended to its intersection with the North line of said Lot 33, said point of intersection being the actual point of beginning of the line being described; thence South along the last described line extended South to its intersection with the South line of said Lot 22 and there terminating; and that part of Lot 29, described as follows: Beginning at the Southeast corner of said Lot 29; thence West along the South line of said Lot 29 a distance of 84.0 feet; thence North to a point on the North line of said Lot 29 which is 81.7 feet West of the Northeast corner of said Lot 29; thence East along the North line thereof a distance of 81.7 feet to the Northeast corner of said Lot 29; thence South along the East line of said Lot 29 to the Southeast corner of said Lot 29 and the point of beginning; all in Block 1, South Harriet Park 2nd Addition, according to the plat thereof on file

and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Except the easterly 150.00 feet of Lot 10, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

That part of Lot 18, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota, lying Westerly and Southerly of a line described as beginning at the Southeast corner of the West 33.50 feet of said Lot 18; thence North 0 degrees 00 minutes 29 seconds East, a assumed bearing, along the east line of said West 33.50 feet of Lot 18 a distance of 137.60 feet; thence Westerly a distance of 26.45 feet along a non-tangential curve, concave to the North, having a radius of 38.42 feet, a central angle of 39 degrees 26 minutes 36 seconds and a chord bearing of North 79 degrees 32 minutes 39 seconds west to the East line of the West 8.00 feet of said Lot 18; thence North 0 degrees 00 minutes 29 seconds East along said East line of the West 8.00 feet of Lot 18 to the north line of said Lot 18 and said line there terminating.

PARCEL 2: The north 100 feet of Lot 18, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota.

PARCEL 3: The west 100 feet of the East 244 feet of the South 150 feet and the West 19 feet of the South 50 feet of the East 144 feet, Lot 18, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION according to the plat and of record in the office of the County Recorder, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

WHEREAS, the owners have requested the subdivision of said tracts into separate parcels (herein called "Parcels") described as follows:

PARCEL 1: Lots 1 and 2, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lot 3, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lots 4 and 6, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lot 5, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lot 7, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK, 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Lots, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17, and Lot 9, except the East 150.00 feet thereof, and the Easterly 45.00 feet of Lots 19, 20, and 21; and that part of Lots 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, and 33, lying East of the following described line: Commencing at a point on the South line of said Lot 24 a distance of 63.00 feet West of the Southeast corner thereof; thence North to a point on the North line of said Lot 28 a distance of 84.00 feet West of the Northeast corner thereof; thence continuing North along the last described line extended to its intersection with the North line of said Lot 33, said point of intersection being the actual point of beginning of the line being described; thence South along the last described line extended South to its intersection with the South line of said Lot 22 and there terminating; and that part of Lot 29, described as follows: Beginning at the Southeast corner of said Lot 29; thence West along the South line of said Lot 29 a distance of 84.0 feet; thence North to a point on the North line of said Lot 29 which is 81.7 feet West of the Northeast corner of said Lot 29; thence East along the North line thereof a distance of 81.7 feet to the Northeast corner of said Lot 29; thence South along the East line of said Lot 29 to the Southeast corner of said Lot 29 and the point of beginning; all in Block 1, South Harriet Park 2nd Addition, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

Except the easterly 150.00 feet of Lot 10, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

That part of Lot 18, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION, according to the recorded plat thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota, lying Westerly and Southerly of a line described as beginning at the Southeast corner of the West 33.50 feet of said Lot 18; thence North 0 degrees 00 minutes 29 seconds East, a assumed bearing, along the east line of said West 33.50 feet of Lot 18 a distance of 137.60 feet; thence Westerly a distance of 26.45 feet along a non-tangential curve, concave to the North, having a radius of 38.42 feet, a central angle of 39 degrees 26 minutes 36 seconds and a chord bearing of North 79 degrees 32 minutes 39 seconds west to the East line of the West 8.00 feet of said Lot 18; thence North 0 degrees 00 minutes 29 seconds East along said East line of the West 8.00 feet of Lot 18 to the north line of said Lot 18 and said line there terminating, and

The West 8.00 feet of that part of Lot 18, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION according to the plat on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, Hennepin County, Minnesota, lying northerly of the South 150.00 feet of said Lot 18, and except for:

That part of the West 49.50 feet of the South 150.00 feet of Lot 18, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION, on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, Hennepin County, Minnesota, lying Westerly and Southerly of a line described as beginning at the Southeast corner of the West 33.50 feet of said Lot 18; thence North 0 degrees 00 minutes 29 seconds East, assumed bearing, along the East line of said West 33.50 feet of said Lot 18 a distance of 137.60 feet; thence Westerly a distance of 26.45 feet along a non-tangential curve, concave to the north, having a radius of 38.42 feet, a central angle of 39 degrees 26 minutes 36 seconds and a chord bearing of North 79 degrees 32 minutes 39 seconds West to the East line of the west 8.00 feet of said Lot 18; thence North 0 degrees 00 minutes 29 seconds East along said East line of the West 8.00 feet of Lot 18 to the North line of said South 150.00 feet of Lot 18 and said line there terminating.

PARCEL 2: The north 100 feet, except for the West 8 feet of that part of Lot 18, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION according to the plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, in and for Hennepin County, Minnesota lying northerly of the South 150 feet of said Lot 18.

PARCEL 3: The west 100 feet of the East 244 feet of the South 150 feet and the West 19 feet of the South 50 feet of the East 144 feet, Lot 18, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION according to the plat and of record in the office of the County Recorder, Hennepin County, Minnesota, and

That part of the West 49.50 feet of the South 150.00 feet of Lot 18, Block 1, SOUTH HARRIET PARK 2ND ADDITION, on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder, Hennepin County, Minnesota, lying Westerly and Southerly of a line described as beginning at the Southeast corner of the West 33.50 feet of said Lot 18; thence North 0 degrees 00 minutes 29 seconds East, assumed bearing, along the East line of said West 33.50 feet of said Lot 18 a distance of 137.60 feet; thence Westerly a distance of 26.45 feet along a non-tangential curve, concave to the north, having a radius of 38.42 feet, a central angle of 39 degrees 26 minutes 36 seconds and a chord bearing of North 79 degrees 32 minutes 39 seconds West to the East line of the west 8.00 feet of said Lot 18; thence North 0 degrees 00 minutes 29 seconds East along said East line of the West 8.00 feet of Lot 18 to the North line of said South 150.00 feet of Lot 18 and said line there terminating.

WHEREAS, the requested subdivision is authorized under Code Section 810 and it has been determined that compliance with the Subdivision and Zoning Regulations of the City of Edina will create an unnecessary hardship and said Parcels as separate tracts of land do not interfere with the purpose of the Subdivision and Zoning Regulations as contained in the City of Edina Code Sections 810 and 850;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby resolved by the City Council of the City of Edina that the conveyance and ownership of the second above described Parcels as separate tracts of land is hereby approved and the requirements and provisions of code Sections 850 and 810 are hereby waived to allow said division and conveyance thereof as separate tracts of land but only to the extent permitted under Code Sections 810 and 850 subject to the limitations set out in Code Section 850 and said Ordinances are not waived for any other purpose or as to any other provisions thereof, and further subject, however, to the provision that no further subdivision be made of said Parcels unless made in compliance with the pertinent Ordinances of the City of Edina or with the prior approval of this Council as may be provided for by those Ordinances.

Adopted this 7th day of December, 1999.

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

*HEARING DATE OF DECEMBER 21, 1999, SET FOR PLANNING MATTER Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust setting December 21, 1999, as hearing date for Preliminary Rezoning and Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Map for Haugland Company, Tracts A and B, Registered Land Survey No 1378 Hennepin County, Minnesota. Generally located east of Highway 169, west of Lincoln Drive and south of Londonderry Drive. Correspondence was received from Mr. & Mrs. Larry Mosow, 6877 Langford Drive, voicing their displeasure with the proposed rezoning by the Haugland Company.

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

***BID AWARDED FOR GMC ½ TON SIERRA PICK-UP TRUCK** Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust for award of bid for one GMC ½ ton Sierra pick-up truck to recommended low bidder, Falls Automotive, Inc., under State Bid Contract #421925 at \$20,247.00.

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

***BID AWARDED FOR 20 ELECTRIC GOLF CARS** Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust for award of bid for 20 electric golf cars to recommended low bidder, E-Z Go Textron, at \$47,900.00.

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

FREEWAY NOISE MITIGATION REPORT HEARD/PETITION RECEIVED Engineer Hoffman explained that ten years ago a study to mitigate freeway noise at Highway 100 and 50th Street North was undertaken. The effort did not go far. In 1997, the State put out a report recognizing 800 plus sites needing noise mitigation. The State had funding for 54 of the sites. One of the "funded sites" was in Edina, on Highway 100 north of 44th Street and east of Highway 100 towards St. Louis Park. In 1998, when the list was completed, residents abutting the Crosstown Highway 62 came forward and voiced their concerns. At that time, the Council directed staff to work with the residents. The result is the Noise Mitigation Report. Mr. Hoffman said the purpose of the study was to find ways to utilize to engage other agencies in developing policies, and solicit funding for noise mitigation improvements. Ten strategies were outlined in the report. Staff has mailed 860 letters to residents as well as executive summaries of the report recently. Neighborhood meetings have been held and were well-attended.

Engineer Hoffman continued with excerpts from the Executive Summary of the Noise Mitigation Study:

- Work with Mn/DOT on a cost-sharing basis to provide privacy fencing and landscaping as part of the TH 100 and TH 62 major maintenance projects that are currently scheduled. Mn/DOT has indicated a willingness to participate in 50 percent of the cost of lightweight privacy fencing in these projects where the replacement of chain link fences is scheduled and where existing chain link fence is outside the clear zone.
- Work aggressively with the Legislature to establish a state funding source for retrofit noise mitigation, privacy fencing and/or landscaping.
- Determine an appropriate level of local funding for fencing and landscaping and leverage those funds to gain higher levels of state and federal participation in projects.
- Identify demonstration projects that might fit the criteria for TEA-21 Enhancement, Livable Communities and Local Road Research Board funding and apply for grants. These funds have not yet been successfully used for noise abatement projects.
- Establish policies and procedures that ensure excess fill materials from City projects are made available for use as noise berms wherever space is available. In addition, work with Mn/DOT, Hennepin County and private contractors to obtain excess fill for this purpose.
- Work with private property owners to identify locations where excess fill could be placed on private property for noise mitigation purposes.
- Participate in the Mn/DOT Community Roadside Landscaping Partnership Program to the greatest extent possible, providing supplemental funds so that more mature planting materials can be used.
- Establish policies, procedures and design standards for the provision of fencing and landscaping in all residential areas along freeways.
- Establish a local cost-sharing policy for fencing and landscaping. The following is suggested, but does not reflect current state or federal statutes
- 50 percent state/federal funding

- 25 percent (general city funds)
- 25 percent neighborhood (special assessments, private funds, in-kind contributions)
- Involve neighborhoods in the final design of fencing and noise walls and in the selection of landscaping materials.

Mr. Hoffman noted that a petition had been received from neighbors in the Cascade, Laura Lane and North Avenue area recommending a 60/30/10 split on who will pay for the mitigation.

Council Comment

Mayor Maetzold inquired to what extent levy limits impact on the City's ability to fund something like this. Manager Hughes answered taxes could be raised enough to maintain a level of service. Other capital improvements or maintenance items could not be funded, at this point. Mayor Maetzold commented that a funding source would need to be found.

Member Kelly asked for clarification on levy limits for the residents in attendance. Mr. Hughes said under current State Law, the City is limited in the amount the tax levy can be increased. In 2000, it is a function of what it levied in 1999. Under State Law this year the tax levy was raised about 3%. Member Kelly reiterated that the State has ham-strung us on Capital Improvement Projects. We cannot increase taxes in an amount that is greater than the levy limit. If the project is to be funded, an alternative means of funding must be secured. Most likely the funds would be secured from the benefited property owners. Mr. Hoffman pointed out some residents had expressed their willingness to pay a portion of the cost of the noise mitigation. Member Kelly added one concern is what to do with cut-through traffic and speeding in the City. There have been extensive talks about the installation of sidewalks, particularly around schools but due to levy limits the funds to do this are not available.

State Representative Erhardt commented that levy limits are in place to prevent local units of government from levying back what the State has done to hold property taxes down. During the past several years, the State has put in millions of dollars for property tax relief. There is a formula that each local government uses which includes a growth factor. He reminded the Council that the legislature has allowed cities to go to the residents to raise additional funds by way of a referendum.

Member Hovland added when local government aid is given to cities by the State, the State requires accountability. Although Edina does not receive local government aid, the issue was raised whether it would be a viable proposition to eliminate levy limits to cities who receive no local government aid from the State. Rep. Erhardt commented the idea could be entertained in the future. Member Hovland stated if that concept has viability it may be worth at least thinking about it in a tax policy possibility with the State. He said there is a boat-load of money in St. Paul and further inquired whether the retrofit noise mitigation legislation could be brought up again as this is not only a problem in Edina. He believes the Edina City Council would be willing to develop a comprehensive plan including noise mitigation. He asked for Rep. Erhardt's help. Rep. Erhardt asked for a copy of the Noise Mitigation Study and said he would do what he could to bring this issue back before the legislature. Assistant Manager Smith gave Rep. Erhardt

Public Comment

Richard Holetz, 4905 Sunnyside Road, stated he has lived in his home since 1942. Mr. Holetz said that Highway 100 is a State road, therefore the State is in violation of state and federal statutes. Mr. Holetz urged that Member Hovland's comments about the nature of the noise issue be put into some formal action and taken to the State for a response. Member Hovland noted that waiting until February is much too long and the process should be in motion well before the session begins.

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

Member Johnson asked from an intergovernmental standpoint, shouldn't similarly affected cities be included in the comprehensive report. He asked who has funded the existing sound barriers in place now. Member Hovland stated he believes they are partially funded by federal and local dollars. Engineer Hoffman stated if the roadway is a new construction, sound walls are a requirement. Member Hovland offered to poll the I-494 Corridor Commission members to discern whether they have noise mitigation issues in their City. He stated a joint powers agreement between the concerned cities may be an appropriate action.

Bill Freeman, 4600 Cascade Lane, said he was a 30 year resident. Mr. Freeman noted that he lived on Cascade Lane when Highway 100 was built. He asked if the Council had considered the use of G.O. Improvement bonds as a method of financing the needed noise mitigation improvements.

Mike Croke, 4508 Laura Avenue, stated that if a twelve foot wall is built he would lose his view. Mr. Croke said that the committee members in his area who circulated a petition for a potential noise mitigation improvement proposed that his property which is abutting the highway pay \$7,000.00 towards the cost of the improvement. Mr. Croke said he does not want to pay that high a level for any improvement.

Steve Snyder, 4601 Sunnyside Road, explained that he lived east of Highway 100 and north of the Mill Pond. Mr. Snyder said the noise level is unacceptable. He added that in his neighborhood property owners even further from the freeway than he, would probably support contributing to a noise mitigation improvement.

Karen Lydon, 5005 West 56th Street, thanked the City for the informational letter. Ms. Lydon asked if a project is constructed would she be specially assessed for the improvement. Mr. Hoffman explained that the noise mitigation study was directed by the Council approximately a year ago. He said he has been working with ad hoc committees from various sections of Edina affected by freeway noise. Ms. Lydon stated she does not have a problem with noise and does not want to participate in the cost of any improvement. She urged the Council to remember that many persons who were not in attendance may also not want any mitigation on their behalf.

Ed Kaisler, 6216 Rolf Avenue, thanked the committee for their work. He said that something is necessary and asked if an improvement reducing the noise level by 5-6 dB were built what sound level would that be correlated to. Mr. Kaisler added that he did not believe a sound barrier will resolve the problem. He related that his home has been on the market for six weeks and that 80% of the potential buyers brought to his home by realtors do not make it all the way to the door because of the noise. Mr. Kaisler noted that he believes within five years the State will be improving Highway 62 to three lanes in each direction and he cautioned the Council not to jump into anything since the State would most likely build sound walls when they improve the highway.

John Palmer, 5101 West 62nd Street, said he was an eleven year resident of the area of Highways 62 and 100. He has seen a significant increase in volume and intensity of traffic. Mr. Palmer believed the increase has affected the property value of his home. He questioned whether there was a legal precedent to proceed on, since the State was not meeting their own noise statutes. Member Kelly said the program that is developed be presented to the State to make our case for State funds must say there is a non-compliance issue which makes the case even more compelling. Mr. Hoffman explained the State and the Legislature are well-aware of the non-compliance issue. Member Johnson inquired whether there was a bi-partisan way to raise noise mitigation to a higher priority. Rep. Erhardt said he did not know, but would pursue the issue.

Tim Crain, 4952 Poppy Lane, complimented the Engineering Department for crafting a study that met the needs of the citizens. Mr. Crain urged the Council to move forward as per the recommendations of the study.

Sue Seckinger, 4912 Sunnyside Road, stated she was a member of the ad hoc committee that had suggested the proposals depicted in the study as 100- O, N, P, Q, R, and S. Ms. Seckinger said she would not like to see neighborhoods pitted against one another and suggested that if portions of the suggested improvements are built, they be done in pairs to reduce the possibility of "noise bounce" across the highways. She asked if there would be a possibility of capturing some type of "gas tax rebate" to finance noise mitigation improvements. Mayor Maetzold said that is an idea that should be pursued. Engineer Hoffman said the problem the State looks at is the cost benefit to build something like this. Member Faust asked how St. Louis Park got 100-R approved. Mr. Hoffman answered that 100-R is one of the 54 sections selected and has been deemed cost effective. Ms. Seckinger submitted a copy of the information provided to neighbors prior to the meeting December 7, 1999.

Dave Price, 4370 Vernon Avenue, said while he favored the proposal, the City should be careful what they ask for from the State.

Morgan Brown, 5033 Normandale Court, urged the Council to keep the process moving forward. He added that he is sympathetic to those residents who do not want to pay for any improvement, but residents also need to realize that it is very unlikely the State would pay 100% of the cost of improvements. He suggested that Rep. Erhardt and the City Council request the State not build the proposed "trolley" and instead earmark those dollars for noise mitigation.

Steve MaKredes, 4916 West Sunnyslope Road, asked if the State has a plan to overlay Highway 100 or the 62 Crosstown with asphalt and what effect that overlay would have on noise mitigation. Mr. Hoffman said he was not aware of any plan to overlay the aforementioned roadways. Mr. MaKredes said it seems like a lot of effort being expended on solving only half a problem.

Council Discussion

Mayor Maetzold noted closure would not be reached tonight but that the preceding comments and discussion is a part of the total process.

Manager Hughes indicated this is not an issue that will be solved overnight. It is staff's recommendation to accept the report and have the issue back on the agenda in a couple of months. In the meantime, he suggested staff craft some ideas to be passed on to our legislators prior to February 1 or prior to the beginning date of the next legislative session.

Member Hovland asked for resolution of whether noise mitigation should be part of the overall comprehensive plan. He stated he liked the idea of a transportation utility being created because we are all in this together. He explained that he too lives close to the freeway. Member Hovland reminded the Council that during the sewer backup problem time, all the residents paid for that cleanup. He asked that funding options be included in the staff report.

Member Faust thanked the neighbors for putting forth their effort and it proves how individuals can work together and make a difference. Mayor Maetzold echoed Member Faust's gratitude.

No Council action was taken.

*RESOLUTION ADOPTED AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF INDIVIDUAL SEWAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM REGULATION TO HENNEPIN COUNTY Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust introducing the following resolution and moving its approval:

RESOLUTION
TRANSFERRING MINNESOTA

AGENCY RULES 7080 TO HENNEPIN COUNTY

WHEREAS the City of Edina has been enforcing the individual sewage treatment system Rules as set for in the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Rules Chapter 7080 and,
WHEREAS, Hennepin County has enacted Hennepin County Ordinance No. 19, adopting Minnesota Rules Chapter 7080, and
WHEREAS, Hennepin County is prepared to enforce these Rules in Edina and,
WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Edina finds that Hennepin County Ordinance No. 19 provides for the same protection of public health and welfare.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Edina hereby transfers the responsibility of enforcing Minnesota Agency Rules 7080 to Hennepin County and,
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that David A. Velde be designated as the agent to act on behalf of the Edina City Council in transferring records held by the City of Edina to Hennepin County.
Dated this 7th day of December, 1999.

Attest: _____

Debra A. Mangen

Dennis F. Maetzold

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

*RESOLUTION ADOPTED AMENDING DELEGATION AGREEMENT WITH MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust introducing the following resolution and moving its approval:

RESOLUTION
AMENDING DELEGATION AGREEMENT

WITH MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

WHEREAS, the City of Edina has a Delegation Agreement with the Minnesota Department of Health to perform Food, Beverage and Lodging establishment inspections, and
WHEREAS, the City of Edina has adopted the Minnesota Food Code, Minnesota Rules 4626.0010 to 4626.1870, and
WHEREAS, the Minnesota Food Code, Rules 4626.0010 to 4626.1870 will become effective January 1, 2000.
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Edina hereby agrees to amend the Delegation Agreement between the Minnesota Department of Health and the City of Edina dated August 1, 1987, by referencing Minnesota Rules 4626.0010 to 4626.1870 in this amendment and to enforce same Rules within the City of Edina.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor and City Manager are hereby authorized and directed to execute any necessary amendment to the August 1, 1987, Delegation Agreement.
Dated this 7th day of December, 1999.

Attest: _____

Debra A. Mangen

Dennis F. Maetzold

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

***YEAR 2000 COUNCIL MEETING DATES AND HOLIDAYS APPROVED** Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust approving the year 2000 Council meeting dates and holiday schedule.

Motion carried on rollcall vote -four ayes.

***RESOLUTION ADOPTED APPROVING AGREEMENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL AID PRESERVATION PROGRAM FOR RED SIGNAL BULB REPLACEMENTS AND SIGNAL PAINTING** Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust approving the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION AND
DELIVERY OF AGREEMENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
FEDERAL AID PRESERVATION PROGRAM
WITH HENNEPIN COUNTY**

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Edina, Minnesota, (the "City") as follows:

Section 1. Recitals. Hennepin County (the "County") has prepared an agreement between the City and County to participate in the LED Replacement and Signal Painting project, City of Edina Improvement No. TS-29. The County will administer and inspect the performance of the contracts.

Section 2. Approvals. The form of the Agreement is hereby approved, and the Mayor and City Manager are authorized to enter into the Agreement on behalf of the City in substantially the form presented to the City with such changes or modifications thereto as do not change the substance of the Agreement and are approved by the Mayor and City Manager, such approval to be conclusively presumed by the execution and delivery of the Agreement by the Mayor and City Manager.

Dated this 7th day of December, 1999.

Attest: _____

Debra A. Mangen

Dennis F. Maetzold

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

***2000 PUBLIC HEALTH NURSING SERVICE CONTRACT AWARDED** Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust awarding the contract for Public Health Nursing Services to the Bloomington Division of Public Health for \$162,005.00 for 2000.

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

***RESOLUTION ADOPTED APPROVING PUBLIC AUCTION OF TAX FORFEIT PROPERTY** Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust approving the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Edina has received from the County of Hennepin a list of lands in said municipality which became the property of the State of Minnesota for non-payment of property taxes, which said list was dated October 13, 1999, Conservation/Non-Conservation Classification List 1106-C/NC.

WHEREAS, the parcels in said list identified as PIN No. 18-028-24-42-0030 (5007 Bruce Avenue) and as PIN NO. 29-028-24-22-0026 (Outlot 1, Evans Addition), have heretofore been classified by the Board of County Commissioners of Hennepin County, Minnesota, as non-conservation land the sale thereof and has heretofore been authorized by said Board of County Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined by the Edina City Council that there is one existing special assessment against the parcel identified as PIN No. 18-028-24-42-0030, (5007 Bruce Avenue) in the amount of \$320.65 for delinquent utility bills on said parcel, and the parcel identified as PIN NO. 29-028-24-22-0026, (Outlot 1, Evans Addition), has no pending or levied special assessments against it; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined by the Edina City Council that the parcel identified as PIN No. 18-028-24-42-0030, (5007 Bruce Avenue) need not be withheld from sale pursuant to M.S. 85.012, M.S. 92.461; M.S. 282.01, Subd. 8; M.S. 282.018, Subd. 1, or M.S. 282.018, Subd. 2; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the City of Edina to acquire the tax forfeited property parcel identified as PIN No. 29-028-24-22-0026, Outlot 1, Evans Addition for use as public right-of-way.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Edina City Council that the said classifications are hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Edina City Council as follows:

1. that, acting pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 282.01, Subd. 7a, it has determined that said parcel 018-028-42-0030 (5007 Bruce Avenue) shall be offered for public sale according to statute.
2. that that the City Clerk be authorized and directed to file, "Application of Governmental Subdivision for Conveyance of Tax Forfeited Lands," for the following described property contained in Hennepin County Conservation/Non-Conservation Classification List 1106 N/NC, said property to be used by the City as hereafter set forth: Outlot 1, Evan Addition (PIN No. 29-028-24-22-0026), Public Right-of-Way.

Adopted this 7th day of December, 1999.

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

*LETTER OF INTENT APPROVED WITH MINNEHAHA WATERSHED DISTRICT BOARD, PAMELA PARK PROJECT Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust approving a Letter of Intent with the Minnehaha Watershed District Board of Directors for the Pamela Park Project.

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

*RESOLUTION ADOPTED ELECTING TO CONTINUE PARTICIPATION IN THE LOCAL HOUSING INCENTIVE PROGRAM - METROPOLITAN LIVABLE COMMUNITIES FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2000 Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust introducing the following resolution and moving its approval:

RESOLUTION ELECTING TO CONTINUE
PARTICIPATING IN THE LOCAL HOUSING INCENTIVES
ACCOUNT PROGRAM UNDER THE
METROPOLITAN LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ACT
CALENDAR YEAR 2000

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Livable Communities Act (Minnesota Statutes Section 473.25 to 473.254) establishes a Metropolitan Livable Communities Fund which is intended to address housing and other development issues facing the metropolitan area defined by Minnesota Statutes Section 473.121; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Livable Communities fund, comprising the Tax Base Revitalization Account, the Livable Communities Demonstration Account and the Local Housing Incentive Account, is intended to provide certain funding and other assistance to metropolitan area municipalities; and

WHEREAS, a metropolitan area municipality is not eligible to receive grants or loans under the Metropolitan Livable Communities fund or eligible to receive certain polluted sites cleanup funding from the Minnesota Department of Trade and Economic Development unless the

municipality is participating in the Local Housing Incentives Account Program under the Minnesota Statutes section 473.254; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Livable Communities Act requires the Metropolitan Council to negotiate with each municipality to establish affordable and life-cycle housing goals for the municipality that are consistent with and promote the policies of the Metropolitan Council as provided in the adopted Metropolitan Development Guide; and

WHEREAS, each municipality must identify to the Metropolitan Council the actions the municipality plans to take to meet the established housing goals through preparation of the Housing Action Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Council adopted, by resolution after a public hearing, negotiated affordable and life-cycle housing goals for each participating municipality; and

WHEREAS, a metropolitan area municipality which elects to participate in the Local Housing Incentives Account Program must do so by November 15 of each year; and

WHEREAS, for calendar year 2000, a metropolitan area municipality that participated in the Local Housing Incentive Account Program during the calendar year 1999, can continue to participate under Minnesota Statutes section 473.254 if; (a) the municipality elects to participate in the Local Housing Incentives Account Program by November 15, 1999; and (b) the Metropolitan Council and the municipality have successfully negotiated affordable and life-cycle housing goals for the municipality:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Edina hereby elects to participate in the Local Housing Incentives Program under the Metropolitan Livable Communities Act during the calendar year 2000.

Passed this 7th day of December, 1999.

Attest: _____

Debra A. Mangen

Dennis F. Maetzold

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

*BRAEMAR ARENA ADVERTISING/EDINA HOUSING ASSOCIATION PROPOSAL APPROVED Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust approving the Edina Hockey Association advertising proposal for the period December 1, 1999, through November 30, 2000.

Motion carried on rollcall vote - four ayes.

*PETITION RECEIVED REQUESTING STREET LIGHT INSTALLATION AT 5001 OAK BEND LANE Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Faust acknowledging receipt of a petition from residents at 5000, 5001, 5004 and 5008 Oak Bend Lane, requesting installation of street lighting at 5001 Oak Bend Lane, and forwarding the petition to the Engineering Department for processing as to feasibility.

Motion carried on rollcall vote -four ayes.

CONCERN OF RESIDENT EXPRESSED Kathleen Godfrey, stated she was concerned about the City's use of Tax Increment Financing in Edina. Ms. Godfrey asked when all the debt would be retired and whether or not a portion of the money intended for use in the Grandview TIF district was coming from other areas. Ms. Godfrey also questioned if an early retirement of the 50th and France or the Centennial Lakes TIF debt were possible. She questioned the HRA's authority to be involved in redevelopment projects and the types of projects allowed under statutes. Mr. Hughes replied that Edina's TIF Districts will expire between 2009 and 2013. When the districts expire all their debt will have been paid. He added that the Grandview Area Tax Increment District is a stand alone district and cannot be pooled with any other district in the City. Mr. Hughes added that a TIF District may be

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

paid off early if sufficient funds within the district exist to pay the principal. Mayor Maetzold explained that during the life of a TIF District the City gets the entire "increment", as opposed to 14% of each tax dollar. Mr. Hughes and Attorney Gilligan explained briefly how projects qualify for inclusion as "public "projects" eligible for use of TIF Funds.

2000 FEES; INCLUDING PUBLIC HEARING ON LIQUOR FEES REVIEWED PLAN Affidavits of Notice were presented, approved and ordered placed on file.

Finance Director Wallin presented the proposed fees and charges set by City Ordinance for 2000. He noted that the fees were increased approximately 3% as discussed during the budget assumption process. It was noted that before raising fees charged for liquor licenses as proposed for 2000, existing licensees were given a thirty-day mailed notice of the hearing and the proposed increases.

Mayor Maetzold called for public comment. No one appeared to speak. Mayor Maetzold closed the hearing.

RESOLUTION APPROVED FOR 2000 PARK AND RECREATION FEES AS AMENDED Member Kelly made a motion, seconded by Member Hovland, introducing the following resolution and moving its adoption. The Council stopped and briefly discussed the fees charged at Braemar. Concern was expressed by Council Members that Braemar was not charging adequately for green fees. Park Director Keprios pointed out that previous Council had intentionally kept green fees low to encourage use of Braemar. He noted the Park Board's recommendation. Council consensus was to increase the green fee for 18 holes non-patrons to \$30.00 and the green fee for 9 holes non-patrons to \$18.00. **Member Kelly amended his original motion incorporating the agreed upon increases for Braemar Green Fees.** Member Faust seconded the motion.

RESOLUTION SETTING 2000 PARK AND RECREATION FEES

BE IT RESOLVED that the Edina City Council does hereby approve and set the following 2000 Park and Recreation Fees.

PARK AND RECREATION

PLAYGROUND	\$13.00
COACH PITCH	N/A
ADULT TENNIS INSTRUCTION	\$37.00
YOUTH TENNIS INSTRUCTION	\$37.00
PEE WEE TENNIS	\$26.00
TEAM TENNIS	\$63.00
TENNIS CAMP	\$79.00
YOUTH SUMMER CLASSIC TENNIS TOURNAMENT	\$13.00
ADULT SUMMER CLASSIC TENNIS TOURNAMENT	\$16.00

ADULT ATHLETIC FEES

SUMMER SOFTBALL		SOFTBALL POST SEASON TOURNEY	
Co-Rec & Mens Classic League	\$360.00	Team Entry Fee	\$55.00
Mens/Womens 35 & Over & Industrial League	\$325.00		
Non-Resident Fee (Individual)	\$26.00	BASKETBALL 5-Man C League	\$425.00
Non-Resident Fee (Team)	\$155.00	5-Man B League	\$425.00
FALL SOFTBALL		HOCKEY	

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

Co-Rec Leagues	\$235.00	4-Man League	\$225.00
Mens Leagues	\$210.00	BROOMBALL	
Non-Resident Fee (Individual)	\$25.00	Co-Rec League	\$300.00
Non-Resident Fee (Team)	\$150.00	BANDY	
VOLLEYBALL		A-Division	\$120.00/h
Officiated Leagues	\$235.00	B-Division	\$120.00/h
Non-Officiated Leagues	\$130.00	C-Division	\$120.00/h
Non-Resident (Individual)	\$10.00		

AQUATIC CENTER
SEASON TICKETS

RESIDENT FAMILY:	2000
First 2 members	*65.00/\$75.00
Each additional member	\$25.00
Maximum (8 members)	\$225.00
RESIDENT INDIVIDUAL:	*40.00/\$50.00
NON-RESIDENT FAMILY:	2000
First 2 members	\$80.00/\$90.00
Each additional member	\$30.00
Maximum (8 members)	\$270.00
NON-RESIDENT INDIVIDUAL	\$50.00/\$60.00
Daily Admission	\$7.00
Admission after 6 P.M.	\$5.00
Aquatic Instruction	\$60.00
* Early Bird Special if purchased no later than May 1, 2000.	

ART CENTER

MEMBERSHIPS: FAMILY - \$35.00 INDIVIDUAL - \$25.00

CLASS FEES * (based on # of hours in class) (Members - 10% discount)	PARENT/CHILD WORKSHOPS* (includes 1 child and 1 adult)
NON-MEMBERS	NON-MEMBER/MEMBER
25 hours \$5.00/hr	1 1/2 hours \$16/\$14
24 hours \$5.00/hr	2 hours \$18/\$16
21 hours \$5.00/hr	3 hours \$22/\$20
14 hours \$5.00/hr	4 hours \$28/\$26
12 hours \$5.00/hr	5 hours \$32/\$29
8 hours \$6.00/hr	6 hours \$35/\$32
5 hours \$6.50/hr	7 hours \$40/\$36
4 hours \$7.00/hr	8 hours \$43/\$39
*all clay and children's classes add \$5.00	*all clay classes add \$5.00

ARENA

Hourly Rate (as of 9/95)	\$130.00
Open skating (Youth and Adult)	\$3.00
Skate Rental	\$1.50
Skate Sharpening	\$3.00

SEASON TICKETS (set first week of September)

RESIDENT FAMILY:	
First 2 members	\$70.00

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

Each additional member	\$5.00
Maximum (7 persons)	\$95.00
RESIDENT INDIVIDUAL:	\$60.00
NON-RESIDENT FAMILY:	
First 2 members	\$85.00
Each additional member	\$5.00
Maximum (7 persons)	\$110.00
NON-RESIDENT INDIVIDUAL	\$70.00
CLASSES	\$79.00

BRAEMAR GOLF COURSE

GREEN FEES

18 hole - non-patron	\$30.00
18 hole - patron	\$21.00
9 hole - non-patron	\$18.00
9 hole - patron	\$12.00
GROUP FEES - 18 holes	\$40.00
GROUP FEES - 9 holes	\$20.00
PATRON CARDS (until April 1)	
Individual	\$60.00
Executive Course	\$25.00
PATRON CARDS (after April 1)	
Individual	\$65.00
Executive Course	\$25.00

COMPUTERIZED HANDICAPS

Resident	\$20.00
Non-Resident	\$24.00

LOCKERS

Men's 72 inch	\$35.00
Men's 42 inch	\$25.00
Ladies 72 inch	\$15.00

CLUB STORAGE	\$35.00
--------------	---------

CLUB RENTAL	\$8.00
-------------	--------

PULL CARTS	\$2.50
------------	--------

GOLF CARS

18 holes	\$24.00
9 holes	\$14.00
18 holes/person with disability/sgl rider	\$14.00
Group Car Fees	\$32.00

GROUP GOLF LESSONS

Adult	\$78.00
Junior	\$36.00

BRAEMAR ROOM

Resident - wedding related	\$675.00
Non-residents - wedding related	\$750.00
Other events	\$275 - \$750

Concession Fees (an annual increase of 5%, as a general rule)

BRAEMAR EXECUTIVE COURSE

GREEN FEES

Adult non-patron	\$10.00
Adult patron	\$8.50
Junior - non-patron	\$7.50
Junior - patron	\$6.50
Golf Cars (everyone)	\$11.00
Pull Carts	\$2.00
Group Fees	\$13.00
DRIVING RANGE	
Large Bucket	\$6.00
Small Bucket	\$4.00
Warm-Up Bucket	\$2.25

FRED RICHARDS GOLF COURSE

GREEN FEES

Adult - non-patron	\$10.50
Adult - patron	\$9.00
Junior - non-patron	\$7.50
Junior - patron	\$6.50
Golf Cars (everyone)	\$11.00
Pull Carts	\$2.00
Group Fees	\$13.00

GOLF DOME

Large Bucket	\$6.25
Senior Bucket	\$6.00
Time Golf ½ hour	\$8.75
Hourly Field Rental	\$110.00
League	\$700.00

EDINBOROUGH PARK

Daily Passes	\$4.00
--------------	--------

SEASON PASSES

Edina Family (first 2 members)	N/A
Each Additional Member	\$25.00
Maximum (7 members)	\$280.00
Edina Individual	\$200.00
Non-Edina Family (first 2 members)	N/A
Each Additional Member	\$30.00
Maximum (7 Members)	\$330.00
Non-Edina Individual	\$230.00
Towel Fee	\$1.00
Skate Rental	\$1.50
Locker Rental	\$0.25

BUILDING RENTALS

Com'l Use/Trade Shows	\$2,500.00	Banners	\$150.00
		Use of Rink	\$125.00
		Area	
		Cover Ice	\$400.00
		Area	
Friday Evening	\$1,600.00	Domestic Photo Shoot (hourly)	

EXCLUSIVE RENTAL

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

Saturday Evening	\$1,600.00	Any Park Area Blocked Off	\$50.00
Prom	\$2,200.00	Grotto	\$75.00
NON-EXCLUSIVE RENTALS: (per hour)		Theatre	\$75.00
Great Hall	\$300.00	Great Hall	\$ 75.00
Theater	\$125.00	Ice Rink	\$100.00
Grotto	\$75.00	Commercial Photo Shoot (hourly)	
		Any Park Area Blocked Off	\$ 200.00
Ice Rink	\$100.00	Grotto	\$ 200.00
Pool (swim team only)	\$14.00	Theatre	\$ 200.00
		Great Hall	\$ 300.00
		Ice Rink	\$ 300.00

CENTENNIAL LAKES

Rental Concession Items		Weekend Rental - Full Evening (6 PM - 1AM)	
Paddle Boats			
4 person boat 1/2 hr	\$ 5.00	Friday evening	\$600.00
Winter sled per hr	\$ 3.00	Saturday evening	\$600.00
Ice Skates	\$ 1.50	Champion Putting	
BUILDING RENTALS		9 hole	\$4.00
1/2 day - Salon	\$100.00	18 hole	\$7.00
Full day - Salon	\$200.00		
Amphitheater Rental		Lawn Games	
Amphitheater Rental	\$75.00/hr	Per Court	\$8.00

PARK DEPARTMENT RENTALS

General Park Areas:		Van Valkenburg/Courtney Fields (Residents Only)	
Resident Use/hour	\$35.00	Per field/day includes building	\$150.00
Resident Use/day	\$105.00	Edina Athletic Associations	
Commercial Use (i.e. TV)/hour	\$65.00	Field User fee/participant	\$7.00
Commercial use with light/hour	\$115.00	Edina Hockey Association Outdoor Hockey Rink	
Picnic shelter/day - Cornelia	\$105.00	Field User fee/participant	\$7.00
Showmobile/day	\$700.00	Park Shelter Buildings (half-day)	
Athletic Fields - Residents Only:		Weber Park	\$25.00
Per field - per day	\$105.00	Cornelia School Park	\$25.00
Per field - per hour	\$35.00	Todd Park	\$25.00
Per field - per hour (with lights)	\$55.00	Walnut Ridge Park	\$25.00
Arneson Acres Terrace Room:		Park Shelter Buildings (full-day)	
Per day/w/formal gardens/gazebo	\$130.00	Weber Park	\$50.00

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

Per hour, first hour	\$ 50.00	Cornelia School Park	\$50.00
Each additional hour up to 4 hours	\$ 25.00	Todd Park	\$50.00
	Rosland Park Pathway:	Walnut Ridge Park	\$50.00
Per hour	N/A		
Per day	N/A		

PEGGY KELLY MEDIA ARTS STUDIOS

DO-IT YOURSELF SERVICES	HOURLY FEE	EQUIPMENT RENTAL	2 DAY RENTAL
Transfer movies to video	\$12.00	35mm Slide Projector	\$15.00
Pictures or slides to video (album)	\$12.00	Dual Slide Projector w/Dissolve Unit	\$30.00
Audio Dubbing or Transfer	\$12.00	VHS Camcorder	\$25.00
VHS Video Editing	\$10.00	Overhead Projector	new \$20.00 old \$10.00
35mm Photo Copies	\$7.00	Opaque Projector	\$20.00
35mm Slide Copies	\$7.00	16mm Movie Projector	\$25.00
VHS Video Copies (up to 3 at one time)	\$4.00	Super 8mm Projector with sound	\$16.00
Foreign Conversion (PAL, SECAM)	\$7.00	8mm Movie Projector	\$11.00
Laminator/Heat Press	\$5.00	Lowell Light Kit	\$20.00
Audio Cassette Dupl.	\$1.00/ copy	Wireless Mike Kit	\$20.00

Customer provides blank cassettes (video and audio), film and lamination supplies.

PHOTO/VIDEO STUDIO RENTAL

Studio - not staffed - Introductory pricing (includes 2 Canon XL1 digital mini-DV video cameras, digital editor, and digital mixer) (props and expendables not included)	\$30.00/hour
---	--------------

COMPUTER OPEN STUDIO TIME

Macintosh G3 or Compaq 266 Mhz PC (includes use of Adobe Photoshop, PageMaker and Illustrator software with Epson Color Stylus printing - prints purchased separately)	\$8.00/hr. non-members pay an add'l \$10.00 daily access fee
---	---

MEMBERSHIP

All equipment or facility rentals requires a membership.

One day/one visit pass - \$10.00	\$10.00
Annual Individual Membership (12 months)	\$25.00
Annual Family Membership (12 months)	\$35.00

Adopted this 7th day of December, 1999.

Rollcall:

Minutes/Edina City Council/December 7, 1999

Ayes: Faust, Hovland, Johnson, Kelly, Maetzold
Motion carried.

RESOLUTION APPROVED FOR 2000 AMBULANCE FEES Member Kelly made a motion to approve and adopt the following resolution:

RESOLUTION
SETTING AMBULANCE FEES FOR 2000

BE IT RESOLVED that the Edina City Council does hereby approve and set the following ambulance service fees for 2000.

AMBULANCE FEES

Service Level Fees for Ambulance Service, including medical treatment and/or transportation to a medical facility:

Level 1 - ON SCENE TREATMENT \$210.00

Specialized medical services performed at
scene with no transport involved

Level 2 - MINOR CARE (BLS) \$465.00

Vital Signs
Splinting
Bandaging, etc.

Level III - MODERATE CARE (ALS) \$570.00

IV, Nitrous, Nitro Spray, ASA
EKG Monitoring
Spine Immobilization

Level IV - MAJOR CARE \$660.00

Medications
MAST (inflated)
Cardiac Pacing
Airway Management

Level V - RESPIRATORY/CARDIAC ARREST \$800.00

Level IV plus any:
Cardio/Pulmonary Resuscitation (CPR)
Defibrillation

OXYGEN ADMINISTRATION \$33.00

MILEAGE FROM SCENE TO HOSPITAL \$9.00/mile

ADDITIONAL MANPOWER OR MECHANICAL
EXTRICATION \$300.00

Member Hovland seconded the motion.

Rollcall:

Ayes: Faust, Hovland, Johnson, Kelly, Maetzold
Motion carried.

RESOLUTION APPROVED FOR 2000 MISCELLANEOUS FEES Member Kelly made a motion to approve and adopt the following resolution:

RESOLUTION
SETTING MISCELLANEOUS FEES
FOR 2000

BE IT RESOLVED that the Edina City Council does hereby approve and set the following miscellaneous fees for 2000:

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

SPILLS RESPONSE

Engine/Fire Company	\$200.00 per hour
HazMat Unit	\$400.00 per hour
Specialized Personnel	
Limited Response	\$100.00 per hour
Specialized Equipment	Cost + 15% administrative charge
Supplies	Cost + 15% administrative charge
Disposal	Cost + 15% administrative charge
Other City Resources	Cost + 15% administrative charge

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Zoning Compliance Letter **\$100.00**

Member Hovland seconded the motion.

Rollcall:

Ayes: Faust, Hovland, Johnson, Kelly, Maetzold

Motion carried.

CLAIMS PAID Motion made by Member Kelly approving payment of the following claims as shown in detail on the Check Register dated December 2, 1999, and consisting of 36 pages: General Fund \$115,665.31; Communications \$12,886.15; Communications \$2,250.00; Working Capital \$6,015.53; Art Center \$24,217.44; Golf Dome Fund \$1,205.41; Swimming Pool Fund \$223.44; Golf Course Fund \$9,195.27; Ice Arena Fund \$3,553.03 Edinborough/Centennial Lakes \$20,854.37; Utility Fund \$301,519.28; Storm Sewer Utility Fund \$14,782.82; Recycling Program \$28.00; Liquor Dispensary Fund \$331,323.77; Construction Fund \$122,245.95; TOTAL \$965,965.77; and for confirmation of payment of claims as shown in detail on the Check Register dated December 2, 1999, and consisting of 6 pages: General Fund \$300,997.63; Working Capital \$1,328.90; Art Center \$195.00; Golf Course Fund \$1,855.57; Utility Fund \$196.34; Liquor Dispensary Fund \$122,397.99; TOTAL \$426,971.43. Faust seconded the motion.

Rollcall:

Ayes: Faust, Hovland, Johnson, Kelly, Maetzold

Motion carried.

There being no further business on the Council Agenda, Mayor Maetzold adjourned the Council Meeting at 10:10 P.M.

City Clerk

- THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY -